

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 DEANGELO LAMONT MITCHELL,)

7 Petitioner,)

8 v.)

9 D.W. NEVENS, *et al.*,)

10 Respondents.)
11 _____)

2:06-cv-00066-RCJ-LRL

ORDER

12 Before the court is petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration of this Court's Order Dated March
13 26th Denying Appellant's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (#18). No opposition was filed.

14 "Reconsideration is appropriate if the court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2)
15 committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening
16 change in controlling law." *School Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263
17 (9th Cir. 1993) (citation omitted). The court does not find clear error in its prior ruling; nor has there
18 been an intervening change in controlling law or the presentation of newly discovered evidence.

19 Accordingly, and for good cause shown,

20 IT IS ORDERED that petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration of this Court's Order Dated
21 March 26th Denying Appellant's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (#18) is DENIED.

22 DATED this 1st day of February, 2008.

23 

24
25 **LAWRENCE R. LEAVITT**
26 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**